

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	)	
	)	
Bertrand LION et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 1796
	)	
Application No.: 10/670,478	)	Examiner: H. PEZZUTO
	)	
Filed: September 26, 2003	)	
	)	
For: NOVEL BLOCK POLYMERS AND	)	Confirmation No.: 7403
COSMETIC COMPOSITIONS AND	)	
PROCESSES COMPRISING THEM	)	

**Mail Stop ISSUE FEE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Notice of Allowability and Statement of Reasons for Allowance dated June 1, 2010. Without withdrawing the claims from issue, Applicant submits these comments to clarify the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance.

In the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance, the Examiner states, "The present invention as defined by the pending claims is allowable for the reasons set forth in communication mailed on 2/17/10." June 1, 2010, Notice of Allowability at 2.

In the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance dated February 17, 2010, the Examiner stated, "A skilled artisan would have been motivated from teachings in prior art disclosures to formulate a non-elastomeric block copolymer having the recited


PDI." February 17, 2010, Notice of Allowability at 2. Applicant notes for the record that it is clear from the context of this sentence that "not" should have been included between "would" and "have been motivated." That is, Applicant believes that the February 17, 2010, Statement of Reasons for Allowance should instead state: "A skilled artisan would not have been motivated from teachings in prior art disclosures to formulate a non-elastomeric block copolymer having the recited PDI."

Please enter these comments and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 23, 2010

By:   
Adam M. Breier, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 63,718